AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c) Attorney Docket No.: A8507

U.S. Application No.: 10/078,419

**REMARKS** 

Claims 1-30 have been examined and rejected on prior art grounds. By this Amendment, Applicants hereby add claims 31 and 32 which are supported by *at least* Figure 2; page 7, lines

Additionally, Applicants hereby cancel claims 1-3, 10-14, and 22-30 without prejudice or

disclaimer. The cancellation of these claims is not an admission that the subject matter

encompassed by the canceled claims is not patentable. Applicants respectfully reserve the right

to pursue additional claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claims 1-3, 10-14, and

22-30, as presented prior to this Amendment in one or more continuing applications.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

14-18; and page 14, lines 7-11 of the specification.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Glass in view of Laiho. Applicants submit that the claims are patentable at least for the following reasons.

Because claims 1-3, 10-14, and 22-30 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, the rejection to these claims is rendered moot.

In order to expedite prosecution, Applicants amend independent claims 4 and 15 by this Amendment<sup>1</sup>. The amended independent claims recite, in some variation, <u>automatically</u> sending a second request to the link checking service to determine validity of a second link. The

<sup>1</sup> The dependent claims have been amended to be consistent with the amendments to the independent claims.

7

Attorney Docket No.: A8507

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)

U.S. Application No.: 10/078,419

amendments are supported at least by page 4, lines 20-21; page 9, line 21 to page 10, line 4; page 13, lines 11-12; and page 14, lines 7-11 of the specification.

Applicants submit that Glass and Laiho, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the newly added features of the independent claims. Specifically, Glass is directed to a method of restoring broken links in which a user requests access to a document by clicking on a hypertext link (see at least Figure 2). If the document in unavailable, the method of repairing the hypertext link is executed. Similarly, Laiho is directed to a method of facilitating the correction of a broken hyperlink in which a user requests the retrieval of a document corresponding to a hyperlink. If the requested document does not exist, the method is executed (page 6, line 25 to page 7, line 20).

Clearly, the methods of Glass and Laiho are both executed <u>in response to a retrieval</u> request by a user. Each reference is silent about any automatic execution of the respective methods. Thus, Glass and Laiho, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest <u>automatically</u> sending a second request to the link checking service to determine validity of a second link, as recited by independent claims 4 and 15. Accordingly, Applicants submit that these claims are patentable. Applicants also submit that claims 5-9 and 16-21 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on one of claims 4 and 15.

## New Claims

Claims 31 and 32 have been added. Applicants submit that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 4 and 15, respectively, and because Glass and Laiho do not teach or suggest the features recited therein. In particular, Glass and Laiho teach

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)

U.S. Application No.: 10/078,419

Attorney Docket No.: A8507

methods in which a retrieval request is sent to a web server from a client computer provided with

a web browser. Glass and Laiho do not teach or suggest a request which is sent from one web

server to another web server.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Sem Com Sean M. Conner

Registration No. 60,840

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/142133

46159

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 28, 2008

9